BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08654 749 2

No. 7599.140

THE TRUSTEES OF THE
PUBLIC LIBRARY
OMNIVM
LVX
CIVIVM
OF THE CITY OF
BOSTON
1852 1878

9 DEC 10

M. MAR 15
A. DEC 4

14

THE NECESSITY OF EDUCATION IN A FREE STATE.

A Lecture Delivered before the
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION,
AT ITS THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING IN BOSTON, AUG. 23D, 1860.

7599.140

BY MOSES T. BROWN,
OF TOLEDO, OHIO.

Published by Vote of the Institute.

BOSTON:
TICKNOR AND FIELDS.
1861.

LECTURE.

THE NECESSITY OF EDUCATION IN A FREE STATE.

7599.140

BY MOSES T. BROWN, Esq.,

OF TOLEDO, OHIO.

On the occasion of the last celebration of the anniversary of American Independence in this city of Boston, New England's favorite orator pronounced the civic oration. Many of you here present listened in person to his glowing and earnest eloquence, and the press, that great servitor of the public, soon brought the printed thoughts to the door of such as were absent.

You will remember how thoroughly the attention of the whole country was arrested, and the comments of the leading journalists showed the current of popular thought to run deep and strong. The orator's theme was the defence of popular government, against, as he expressed it, "misgivings at home and disparagement abroad."

The immediate occasion was the assertion of Earl Grey, made in a debate in the House of Lords, on the 19th of April, on the question of the extension of the elective franchise in England. The example of the

Inw 5595, b
98653
Dec. 13, 1860

United States was quoted as showing the evils of enlarged suffrage. The British Lord asserted that in the United States, since the Revolutionary period, and by the undue extension of the right of suffrage, "our elections have become a mockery, our legislators venal, our courts tainted with party spirit, our laws cobwebs, which the rich and poor alike break through, and the country and government, in all its branches, given over to corruption, violence, and a general disregard of public morality." The answer to this scathing criticism of the English Lord was, not alone a noble defence of the right of free suffrage, but a glowing prophecy of the future greatness of the Republic, and of the entire safety of resting the government in the hands of the governed people.

But, is it not well to consider whether there is no significance in the fact that so eminent an orator and thinker should deem it necessary to go into a defence, before the country, of our free institutions, and whether the very eagerness with which the press and people received and adopted this defence, while it shows a deep rooted attachment to popular government, does not also show a lurking suspicion in the popular mind that we shall repeat the history and experience of the earlier Republics, and that there is well grounded apprehension, (to quote Mr. Everett's inquiry on that occasion,) "that we have, indeed, reached, that we have passed, the meridian, and have now to look forward to an evening of degeneracy, and the closing in of a rayless and hopeless night of political decline."

With none of the spirit of an alarmist, would I

quote Lord Macaulay's opinion of our government, as expressed in a letter written in 1857, in reply to Henry S. Randall, the author of the "Life of Jefferson."

Said the English historian: "I am certain that I never wrote a line, and that I never in Parliament, in conversation, or even on the hustings, uttered a word indicating an opinion, that the supreme authority of a State ought to be intrusted to a majority of citizens, told by the head. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty or civilization, or both."

I have not quoted the hostile opinions of these thoughtful men, to weaken your faith in the permanency of our institutions. Loyalty to administrations there may not be in this country; loyalty to the principles underlying our government there is. Indeed, it is deeper than mere opinion; it is born of the race from which we come, and there is much generic truth in what has been alleged, that all Saxons are Protestants, and all Celts Catholic,— that Celts love unity of power, and Saxons the representative principle. Emerson has said truly, that race in the Negro is of appalling importance. I am aware that it is no unusual thing for Americans, when abroad, to speak slightingly of their country, and some of the representatives of our national government have given little of sympathy or encouragement to the free spirit in Europe. What wonder that the unfriendly echo of their words sometimes reaches us, from those educated under a constitutional monarchy so secure and well-founded as England.

I see before me Educators from all parts of our common country, — men who have given a life-time to the service of the great cause that calls us together here to-day, and at whose feet I feel like sitting, wanting experience, wanting knowledge, wanting everything, save a little of enthusiasm,— and to such men I appeal, to say whether, in their opinion, there is no danger that this grand experiment of Free Government now on trial here, "for the whole world and for all time," may prove a failure; and prove so, because of a neglect of those means which past experience, the unanimous testimony of the founders of these free Commonwealths, and their own settled convictions, alike declare to be indispensable in a government founded upon the popular will. With no hope of giving you new thought, and with a consciousness that the subject has been often presented by those able to treat it both wisely and with learning, I ask your attention to some thoughts upon "*The Necessity of Education in a Free State.*" Carlyle, in one expressive sentence, thus sums up the highest office and use of human government: "The great test of government," said he, "is to educate men." And Daniel Webster expressed the same thought as tersely, and with better directness to our times, when he said, "The merit of the Colonies was, that they produced Washington."

Now, the thought here is, not alone that institutions produce men, that out of the exigencies of the times, out of the troubles, prosperities, or decay of Governments, arise the Washingtons or Garibaldis, master spirits, to "ride the whirlwind and direct the storm" of revolution, but that no Government can be

secure which does not educate the mass of its subjects into a recognition of the principles upon which the State is founded, and respect for the governing powers. A Government may thus be termed, in one sort, a huge machine, whose office it is to manufacture opinions, to perpetuate rulerships, and so to strengthen the power and influence of the State. Luther applied this principle in religion, and seems to have regarded the school as a necessity in a Protestant community. It cannot be otherwise, as a protest without a reason is senseless. The idea at the base of the reformation was the assertion of the right of every man to do his own thinking in affairs of religion, and it implied far more than this. The duty to educate the child, that he might be able to think. "Send your children to school," said the great refomer, "and if they have to beg for a living, you have nevertheless given to God a noble piece of timber, out of which he will carve something."

Thus, all Governments tend to become mere conservators of the idea upon which they are based. What are our histories but the record of the attempts of Governments and rulers to maintain ideas made visible in institutions, from hostile forces within or without the State. Thus, in Persia, Crete, and Lacedemon, public institutions were formed to regulate and promote the education of children in things calculated to render them useful citizens, and to adapt their minds and manners to the genius of the Government.

The Empire of Rome was founded on military supremacy; hence the education of the people became a military education. It served its use; lacking the

moral element, — lacking those spiritual forces which form a national conscience, — what wonder that the northern Goth and Vandal, and the more terrible scourges of wealth and luxury, finally triumphed!

England, whose common people are inborn democrats, with a native dislike of political or social inequalities, perpetuates, through the force of ancient law, custom and education, her nobility and her aristocracy. Her great Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge graduate England's chivalry, and are practically shut against the unprivileged classes. Said the observant author of "English Traits," "These seminaries are finishing schools for the upper classes, and not for the poor. Oxford, which equals in wealth several of the smaller European States, shuts up the lectureships which were made (by the old charter) public for all men thereunto to have concourse, and misspends the revenues bestowed for such youths 'as should be most meet for towardness, poverty and painfulness.'"

You will pardon one other illustration of this truth, drawn from our early colonial history, showing that the Colonists from Great Britain brought with them fixed ideas, both of government and religion, which they attempted to organize into a State and to preserve by educational forces. At Jamestown and at Plymouth two English colonies were planted, differing in purpose, and widely differing in both civil and religious ideas. The English Cavalier at Jamestown was a Monarchist. The Puritan was a Democrat. The Cavalier was a conformist; the Puritan a nonconformist in religion. The former represented the visible court and church of England. The latter was

inspired with a vision of a new State without a king, and a new church without a bishop. Now, history relates, that sixty-four years after the settlement of Virginia, Sir William Berkeley, then Governor of the Province, in an official communication to the Lords of the Colony, said, "I thank God, that there are no free schools, nor printing presses here, and I hope we shall not have them for these hundred years, — for learning hath brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world, and printing hath divulged them in libels against the best of governments."

How was it with the colony at Plymouth? Turning to the records, we find Roger Ludlow, in 1642, inciting the colonial legislature to give attention to domestic education, and defining the "Barbarism of Ignorance" with as much caustic severity as a Massachusetts Senator of to-day would the "Barbarism of Slavery!" The Legislature, among other laws, enacted — "Forasmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoof and benefit to any Commonwealth, and whereas many parents and masters are too negligent of their duty in that kind — the Selectmen of every town, in the several precincts and quarters where they dwell, shall have a vigilant eye over their brethren and neighbors, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families, as not to endeavor to teach, by themselves or others, their children or apprentices, so much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the English tongue, upon penalty of 20 shillings for each neglect therein."

A further enactment provided for the support of

the teacher, "that the colony might never be without a 'sufficient schoolmaster.'"

Now I insist that Sir Wm. Berkeley was as true an educator, for a purpose, (the purpose to strengthen the idea upon which the colony was founded,) as was Puritan Roger Ludlow.

Look at the circumstances! A new country gave ample opportunity to ultimate the representative ideas of the two classes in England, to wit, the aristocratic and the democratic. And each used the means best adapted to the end to be produced. The operative principle was the same in either case, viz.: Educating the people into loyalty to the State.

Here, then, in America, by these two colonists was a statement of two ideas, antagonistic in their nature and operation, one or the other of which has been at the foundation of every State, so modified, however, by circumstances, that no government has wholly and purely illustrated eithe r.

They may be stated briefly, as 1st — The Absolutist idea, that man was made for the State and to serve it. 2d, — The Democratic idea, that the State should be made by man and to serve him.

The thirteen colonies, through their representatives, in the old Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, although some contrariety of opinion existed, with singular unanimity, declared for the Democratic idea. That the individual is superior to the State, that the office of the State is to secure to him the right to himself and to the results of his employed faculties. That man (to quote Bancroft) is superior to his accidents, or, as an eloquent German in the West, who I believe

comprehends, from his Saxon composition, the genius of our institutions, has stated it, paraphrasing Jefferson's immortal declaration of the inalienable right of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,

> To man, his birth-right. To labor — freedom.
> To him who wants to labor — work and independence.
> To him who works — his dues.

The argument of the necessity of an active and thorough system of education, to give permanency and life to a State founded upon such ideas, is so direct and plain as to seem almost axiomatic. It is stating a conclusion, the premises for which are already obvious. The plainest statement is, therefore, the best. Our government is founded, in exact words, "in the consent of the governed." The people are sovereign in fact, as well as in theory, hence the great conservative power must be popular intelligence, acting through the medium of public opinion, and the great destructive power, popular ignorance, acting though the same medium. In this view, what a significance have our popular elections! What an engine of conservation or destruction is the ballot-box. The ballot of the citizen becomes the supreme power in the State.

Said Robert Rantoul, — "Every man among us is called upon to pass his judgment upon the most complicated problems of political science. Ought he not to understand that which he must decide? And how can he understand these often abstruse and really difficult questions, without a knowledge of the particular facts in the case before him, and correct

general information upon political economy, history, the nature, attributes, and mode of operation of civil government, and above all, the nature of man. These are essential to intelligent legislation, and with us every voter is a legislator, for he chooses his representatives, with express reference to their opinions upon a thousand matters which he has already settled in his own mind."

Fortunately, there is little need of urging argument upon this topic, to insure its general recognition among the mass of the people, for with all the evidences of our material prosperity, there comes, we are glad to think, the increasing evidence, that deep in the popular heart rests, secure, the conviction that without education there can be no such thing as self-government. I said that there was a conviction of the necessity of education to the security of the State; perhaps I had better have said a popular sentiment in that direction, which it is our duty to ripen into a real and lasting conviction.

In this matter of education, people are ready to assent to general propositions. They are ready to educate in the abstract. It is well, say they, that the State should foster learning, or the city found the public schools. It is good to have the public library and the lyceum, and, now-a-days, the gymnasium. It is a sad thing, say they, to see the neglected children of the street, and to know that neglect is hardening them into that dangerous class, food for gunpowder abroad, but which here fills our prisons and swells our criminal calendar! The perpetual product of our boasted civilization! The perpetual

reproach of our philanthropy! The perpetual shame of our Christianity!

Do we consider the trite truth, perhaps often spoken and many times, yet always too solemnly true to make it out of place again to utter it: that the child must be educated, whether we will it or not. By the very fact of the endowment of faculties, by the force of the natural laws of growth and expansion, by the existence of external nature, awakening thought, desire, feeling! by the gift of a soul, and the hope of immortality! God has put in our hands the means, will he not hold us responsible for the results? In the primal sense and full signification of that derived word in our tongue, let every child born into the State receive the education of virtue through home influence, the school, the lyceum, the church, rather than that of vice through neglect, the street, and the saloon. Educated in a just sense! Led upward! Led out of the mere existence he has in common with all animals! Out of the reign and rule of evil propensities; out of the despotism of the passions and the hopeless bondage of the vices; into that true freedom, which will result in the enlightened understanding, the disciplined temper, mind, and habit of mature manhood!

Yes; this is the real use of life, is it not? Tell me why this round earth belted with zones? Why the suggestive stars at night? Why the appealing mysteries of God's natural laws, hidden to the unobservant? Why these universal human instincts, drawing us together in families, home, and society, if they be not

God's appointed means to discipline us, so that, at the last,

> "The mind and soul according well,
> May make one music as before."

In conclusion, it has seemed proper and fit to use the remainder of the time allotted me, in discussing two prominent sources of danger to our system of public education, and thereby to the State: —

1st. The danger from the foreign element in our midst, — the danger from immigration.

2d. The danger to our schools arising from sectarian influences.

Each year brings to our shores thousands of emigrants from the over-peopled countries of Europe. Led by the same considerations that tempt the mass of mankind everywhere to quit the soil that bore them, they come with the simple desire to better their condition!

The policy of our States has been, in the main, liberal toward the foreigner. Only now and then has the political sea been lashed into fury, by competition in labor, by political or religious differences of opinion, or by the strong antipathies of races, to become calm again when the immediate exciting cause had died out, through the return of reason and the all-pervading sentiment of toleration.

This liberality towards those of foreign birth is due, perhaps, as much to the fact, that our country is new, our lands unoccupied, our physical resources undeveloped, as to the existence of those higher sentiments of equality and political justice, which prompt us to

welcome others to the enjoyment of blessings so much prized by ourselves.

Glancing at the census tables, one is surprised at our power of absorbing and assimilating the foreign element. In that great year of immigration into this country, 1851, more than four hundred thousand persons landed upon our shores. Pushed away by their necessities from our crowded seaport cities, the Great West received them hospitably, and forthwith began to Americanize, assimilating them with the same ease that her prairies drink in the rain and dews. Thus immigration, so far as our material interests are involved, is an incalculable blessing. Every immigrant, willing to work, adds something to the wealth of the State he enters. He also helps to elevate the standard of general intelligence among the native population, by forcing the American-born into those pursuits requiring more of brain than muscle. As might be expected, he brings with him a love for the social customs, and (if he has not been oppressed by them at home) for the political and religious institutions of the country from which he comes. His first instinct is, to reproduce in this new land the familiar home customs and home institutions which he prizes, and strenuously to oppose those which he is conscious have enslaved him. Our Puritan ancestors did the same. It is the universal human instinct!

Now to state the plain statistical fact, that thousands of foreign birth are annually landing upon our shores, — that many of them, victims of oppression abroad, by a strange impulse of nature ally themselves with tyranny and vice, and oppose free sentiments

and education, suggests with emphatic earnestness the practical questions which must present themselves to the mind of the statesman and the educator, how shall this vast tide of human life be prevented from inundating us? how led into the peaceful channels of industry and thrift, and into a cheerful obedience to law, justice, and right?

In answer to these questions, I have endeavored to show the "Necessity of Education as a conservative power in a Free State," and this necesssity imposes upon us a duty, which it is suicide to omit, — the duty to educate.

The State then is bound, as a measure of self-preservation, to provide for the secular and rudimental education of its whole population. And, 2d, it should provide for the education, by public schools, of every child within its borders, and should remove and avoid any just and well-founded grounds of complaint existing in the minds of any portion of the people against the public schools.

This leads me to the discussion of a question upon which, I am aware, there are wide differences of opinion among educators, and among some portion of the people, — decided, and in many instances prejudiced, opinions, — but which I do not feel at liberty to pass by, believing it to be a vital, practical question, and one which must sooner or later be met. I refer to the question, How far can religious education be made a part of our school system, and what concessions, if any, is it right and just to make to those holding different opinions in regard to religious teaching in our public schools?

Two cases of comparatively recent occurrence seem to force this question upon us. The case (no doubt fresh in your minds) of the boy Wall, in this city of Boston, who was punished by his teacher for a persistent and firm refusal to join in the religious exercises recommended by the School Committee of the city, having been instructed by his father and by his religious teacher not to take part in them.

The other, the more recent difficulty in the city of New York, in which it is alleged that teachers of one religious faith were removed from the public schools, and their places filled by those of another faith, not on grounds of incompetency or unfitness, but on strictly sectarian grounds. I do not cite these cases to discuss them at all, nor to advance any opinions upon particular circumstances in either case, which might be urged to palliate or excuse what, at first, might seem the plainest and most flagrant violation of the rights of conscience. I refer to them simply and earnestly to call your attention to the fact that these differences of opinion exist, that they are endangering our public school system, and are crippling its usefulness for a large class, whom to neglect is to consign to ignorance, vice, and crime, and to convert into enemies to social order and to the security of the State "the dangerous class," as they are expressively termed in Europe.

It must be remembered, too, that this contest has its origin in the religious differences of those who are equally taxed to support the public schools, and who, by right, can claim equal benefits in them. And when we consider the tenacity with which we, our-

selves, cling to the religious faith of our fathers, — the faith taught us at our mother's knee, hallowed by the recollections of early childhood, and made stronger and more real in our mature manhood by the severe discipline and trial of life, — we shall not, I am sure, wonder that others have as strong convictions and as real attachments to an early faith deeply rooted in the soul, but shall be constrained to exercise that generous charity, "which suffereth long, and is kind," the chiefest ornament of Christian character!

In discussing this question of the differences between the two great divisions of Christians, the Catholics and the Protestants, in regard to religious instruction in the Common Schools, two capital errors seem to be widely entertained. The first error is, the assumption that our State and Federal governments are Protestant, or, in other words, that the State is Protestant because a majority of the present inhabitants of the United States are Protestants.

Now the State is Christian in its laws and institutions, but there is no State form of religion. England and Prussia are Protestant States, for Protestantism is the form of Christianity officially recognized by the State. Protestantism is the State religion. The Constitution of the United States establishes no form of religion. It is neutral and wholly tolerant. There is no direct word in it upon the subject. The only clause that I can find bearing at all upon this question is negative in character. A part of Art. IV. of the Constitution, regarding the oath of public officers, reads: "But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust in the United States."

As in the United States Constitution, so in most of the State Constitutions that I have been able to examine, there is no assumption that the State is Protestant. This Commonwealth of Massachusetts has struck out from its Constitution the only word which could justify the assertion that the State is Protestant. A clause in Art. III. of that part of the Massachusetts Constitution, called "A declaration of the rights of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," as it originally stood, reads: "As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality, therefore the people of this Commonwealth have the right to invest the Legislature with power to authorize and require the several towns, parishes, &c., to make provision for the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily."

Now, note the growth of tolerant opinion! An amendment adopted by the Legislatures of the years 1832 and 1833, and approved and ratified by the people, was substituted for this article. It is Art. XI. of the amendments to the Constitution, and in the Revised Statutes of 1835 is described by the title, "Religious Freedom Established." The amendment, after the same general recital, proceeds: "Therefore the several religious societies of the Commonwealth, whether corporate or unincorporate, shall have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers." Thus striking out the word Protestant, and the re-

quirement, by State authority, to support any form of religious worship. The State of New Hampshire has an article in her Constitution prohibiting a Catholic from holding office, but the spirit of the people is opposed to such a test; and the largest city in the State was represented, in part, in the last Legislature, by a Catholic, and no movement was made to enforce this obsolete clause of the Constitution. In the discussion of this question, it is important to remember that the State is not Protestant, but that our civil institutions were founded in toleration of all shades of religious opinion, without partiality to any.

The second error, — one quite as common, and more prejudicial to a hopeful settlement of these unfortunate differences, — is the belief that the Bible, in King James' version, which is to the Protestants the revealed will of God, cannot be conscientiously regarded by any as a sectarian book, and therefore that conscientious scruples against our common English version are entitled to no respect. This is neither the time nor place, if one had the inclination, to enter into a discussion of the merits, historical correctness, or points of difference, between the King James and the Douay versions of the Scriptures. It would add nothing to the argument, to show that there are unimportant differences, that the division of the first commandment, as it is contained in the Catholic Catechism, into a first and second, as by the Prostestants, or the division of the Protestant tenth commandment into the ninth and tenth by the Catholics, is right or wrong. I leave such inquiries to those who wish to thread them, simply asking either party,

who conscientiously believes himself to be right and another wrong, in regard to this question, whether this other may not have precisely the same reason that he himself has for his belief, namely; the religious influences, opinions and teachings by which he is surrounded, and may conscientiously believe no version of the Scriptures to be the true word of God, unless sanctioned and approbated by his religious teachers and church.

Having thus attempted to show that the State is not Protestant, but neutral and wholly tolerant in its spirit, I ask your attention to the position of the State (in most, if not all our separate States, the same), towards the different religious sects so far as our Public Schools are concerned. I quote the Massachusetts Constitution as reflecting the sentiment of nearly all our States. After establishing the right of each individual to worship God, according to the dictates of his own conscience, and proclaiming the equality of all religious sects and denominations, in the eye of the law, it thus guards the common school:

Art. 18 — (amendment to Constitution of Massachusetts) — "All moneys raised by taxation, in the towns and cities, for the support of Common Schools, shall be applied to and expended for no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is to be expended, and such money shall never be appropriated by any religious sect for the maintenance, exclusively, of its own schools."

This is the answer of the State of Massachusetts,

(and I believe it is the spirit of the other States of the Confederacy), to any sect (Catholic or Protestant), which asks the establishment of separate sectarian schools, and the employment for their support of the public moneys! And this, it must appear, is exact justice! The State says to all alike, "Here is the common school, it is for you, come and enjoy its advantages; within its walls we know no sects or denominations."

Thus is the question of privilege met; and if this important ground can be sustained, no ecclesiastic power, never so well organized or subtle, can work us harm. Rightful and just concessions of a strong majority toward a weak minority will only strengthen the power of the common school, and endear it to the hearts of our entire people.

And, I ask you, thoughtful and liberal-minded men and women of New England, "Can there be no common ground of moral instruction for our common schools, upon which both the great divisions of Christendom and each sect of Protestants can stand? Can that church, which through the night of the dark ages preserved the Christian Scriptures, whose bosom nurtured Fenelon and prayerful Thomas à Kempis, and many another sainted name, which recognizes the same Great Head of the Church, and bears the same symbol of Christian faith upon its art-preserving cathedrals in foreign lands, or upon its simple chapels on our Western frontier! — can it refuse to meet you, tolerantly, upon this subject? While I do not pretend to indicate any specific means, by which this result can be accomplished, yet

I have faith that time and the tolerant spirit of the people will settle this difference.

Ladies and gentlemen, — To-day you are gathered here from all parts of our Union, to consult together for the interests and safety of popular education. Into your hands the State has given its most precious interest — that of educating its youth. It has been my wish to discuss this question as a practical one, for as such it has been forced upon me. So I have tried to urge upon your attention considerations (often urged, but none the less important still), of the "Necessity of Education to the perpetuity of a Free State," and from this necessity, arguing the duty imposed upon the State to provide for the education of its whole people, as a measure of self-preservation; and also to provide for the education, by public schools, of every child, removing and avoiding well-founded grounds of offence or complaint against them, urged by any portion of those who support them. I have also hinted at the danger to our institutions, and to our system of public schools especially, from the foreign element, and from the conflict of religious opinions.

These are not imaginary dangers; would they were so! "The Greeks are at your doors, madam," said John Randolph to one anxious about the Greeks she had never seen. Unfortunately we are not left to speculate upon supposed influences. The uneducated foreigner is here. He has brought his language, customs and religion. By our declaration of rights, holding all men free; by our proclaimed toleration of all creeds and opinions; by our vast country need-

ing development and asking labor, we have invited him to come. To his children, as well as to the native born, we must commit the future destinies of our country. May God give us wisdom in this hour of our peril. Remember, no desert is so arid, no desolation so complete, no waste so unrelieved, as the uncultured human soul.

Well has the despairing poet sung:

There is a wilderness more dark
  Than groves of fir on Huron's shore,
And in that cheerless region, hark!
  What serpents hiss! what monsters roar!
'Tis not among the untrodden isles
  Of vast Superior's stormy lake,
Where social comfort never smiles,
  Nor footsteps pierce the tangled brake!
'Tis in the dark, uncultured soul,
  By education unrefined,
Where vengeful malice, vices foul,
And all the hateful passions prowl,
  The frightful wilderness of mind!